Appl. No. 10/605,613
Amdt. dated June 27, 2006
Reply to Office action of May 02, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Objection to the drawings:

5   The drawings are objected to because the specification repeatedly refers to plural "columns" of an identity table, each column corresponding to an identity of a host; whereas the drawings illustrate plural rows of the identity table, each row corresponding to the identity of the host.

Response:

10   The specification has been amended to correct this error and other grammatical errors. Paragraphs 0019, 0024, 0027, 0037, 0038, 0040, and 0041 have been amended to change the word "column" to become "row", and to change the word "notice" to become "notify". No new matter has been added through the amendments to the specification. Acceptance of the corrected specification is respectfully requested.

15

2. Rejection of claims 1-5 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 1-5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amro et al. (US 6,664,949, hereinafter Amro) in view of Kitao et al. (US 6,160,491, hereinafter Kitao).

20

Response:

The applicant would like to point out the patentable features of the claimed invention with respect to the prior art.

25   Claim 1 contains the limitations of "entering a registration mode", "updating an identity table of the wireless input apparatus", and "supporting the hosts selectively according to the identity table." On the other hand,

10

neither Amro (in column 4, lines 49-58; or in column 5, lines 1-9) nor Kitao (in column 3, lines 27-33; or in column 10, lines 22-41) teach anything related to "entering a registration mode".

Furthermore, although Kitao mentions in column 3, lines 27-33, and in column 10, lines 22-41 a function that is similar to that of an identity table, Kitao does not teach any actions similar to "updating an identity table of the wireless input apparatus". Therefore, the combination of Amro and Kitao fails to teach all of the claimed limitations of claim 1, and claim 1 should be allowable over the cited prior art.

Claim 3 contains the limitations of "a control circuit for controlling the input apparatus", "an input interface for receiving an input information to generate a control signal, and for receiving an identity selected from a plurality of predetermined identities as a transmitting identity", "a storage device for storing an identity table and an identity in a non-volatile way, the identity table comprising a plurality of predetermined identities", and "a first radio module for transmitting a radio packet, the packet comprising the transmitting identity and the control signal". On the other hand, Amro's keyboard 102 does not contain a control circuit, an input interface, a storage device, or a first radio module. In Amro's disclosure (column 4, lines 49-58; and column 5, lines 1-9), Amro does not teach any devices having functions similar to the claimed control circuit, input interface, storage device, and first radio module. Therefore, claim 3 should be allowable over the cited prior art.

Claim 4 has been amended to correct an error. Claim 4 now specifies that the control circuit of the input apparatus updates the contents of the identity

11

Appl. No. 10/605,613
Amdt. dated June 27, 2006
Reply to Office action of May 02, 2006

table according to the control packet. No new matter has been added through this amendment.

Claim 5 recites that "the input interface will generate different control
5   signals when different keys are depressed". However, Amro teaches in column 2,
lines 39-41 the use of a keyboard, but does not teach that when different keys are
depressed that the input interface will generate different control signals. Therefore,
claim 5 should be allowable over the cited prior art.

10   Regarding **claim 10**, Kitao does not teach in column 3, lines 27-33 and column
10, lines 22-41 the claimed limitations of "the control packet **comprising an identity
code...**" and "**...the control circuit will add** the identity code corresponding to the
host in the identity table **as a predetermined identity code for updating the
identity table.**" Thus, the prior art fails to teach all of the claimed limitations of
15   claim 10, and claim 10 should be allowable over the cited prior art. Furthermore,
claims 2, 4-5, and 10 are dependent on claims 1 and 3, and should be allowed if
claims 1 and 3 are allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1-5 and 10 is respectfully
requested.

20   3. Rejection of claims 6-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):
Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
Amro et al. (US 6,664,949, hereinafter Amro) in view of Kitao et al. (US 6,160,491,
hereinafter Kitao), and further in view of Mizoguchi et al (US 2002/0089816,
hereinafter Mizoguchi).
25
Response:
Regarding **claim 6**, paragraphs 0092-0095 of Mizoguchi and "The Bluetooth
Standard" fail to teach the claimed limitation of "a service notice packet **comprising**

12

Appl. No. 10/605,613
Amdt. dated June 27, 2006
Reply to Office action of May 02, 2006

an identity code of the input apparatus".

Regarding claim 8, paragraphs 0092-0095 of Mizoguchi and "The Bluetooth Standard" fail to teach the claimed limitation of "...transmitting a service request packet with the second radio mode". Furthermore, claims 6-9 are all dependent on claim 3, and should be allowed if claim 3 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 6-9 is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Sincerely yours,

Winston Hsu   Date: June 27, 2006

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526
P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.
Voice Mail: 302-729-1562
Facsimile: 806-498-6673
e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)

13